

REMARKS

In order to help expedite prosecution, Applicant would like to address the comments made by the Examiner in the Continuation Sheet attached to the Advisory Action mailed September 27, 2007. More specifically, in the second paragraph of the Continuation Sheet, the Examiner asserts that the arguments traversing the rejection under §112, second paragraph, were considered, but were not considered persuasive for the following reasons:

Although it may be well known that electronic mail is transmitted from personal computers, this transmission may occur in a variety of ways. For example, Ethernet cards, wireless network adapters, and software programs such as Microsoft Outlook may all be reasonably construed as “means for transmitting an electronic mail.” Consequently, the specification does not inherently disclose *a particular “means for transmitting”* and the claim remains unclear. [emphasis added]

First, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, there is no requirement that the specification disclose a “*particular ‘means for transmitting’*” to satisfy §112, second paragraph. Instead, §112, second paragraph, is satisfied with respect to means-plus-function language if *any* means for transmitting is disclosed.

Second, although the specification does not describe, for example, a specific software program, such as Microsoft Outlook, used in the transmission of electronic mail, there is no requirement that to satisfy §112, second paragraph, the specification must explicitly describe the means for performing a function. The only requirement is that one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to identify structure for performing the recited function (i.e., “means for transmitting an electronic mail....”).

It is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art that would clearly identify that the “mail clients” described in the specification, such as a personal computer 2, perform the recited function of “transmitting an electronic mail.”

Further, the Examiner is reminded that a patent specification does not have to describe in detail those elements that are known in the art. For example, personal computers are well known. There are many issued patents whose specifications simply describe a personal computer (PC) to perform a certain operation or function, without describing the detail of the specific operating system, microprocessor, memory system, etc, used by the PC.

It is submitted that the types of hardware and software of an “electronic mail client” that transmit electronic mail are known in the art, and that applicant’s specification has satisfied §112, second paragraph, (and §112, first paragraph).

Finally, in the third paragraph of the Continuation Sheet, the Examiner states:

Regarding the argument that Glasser does not teach the claimed bypass permission table, the argument corresponds to newly added limitations and will be addressed when the proposed amendments are entered. *However, regarding the use of Glasser to reject previously presented claims 9-11, it is noted that Glasser contemplates use of the invention “to administer access permissions for many different kinds of resources besides file systems and printers.”* [emphasis added]

It is not clear why the Examiner identifies claims 9-11 because these claims are dependent claims depending from claim 1. Nonetheless, it is submitted that **Glasser** does not suggest the type of “permission” that is authorized by the claimed bypass permission table.

In view of the foregoing remarks and those set forth in the Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 filed on September 19, 2007, it is submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection and an indication of allowability of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that there are issues remaining to be resolved in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite and complete prosecution of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



William M. Schertler
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 35,348
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

WMS/dlt